

REMARKS

Claims 1-32 were originally submitted.

Claims 33-40 were previously added.

Claims 16, 17, and 18 are currently amended.

Claims 1 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,226,752 to Gupta et al (Gupta).

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta.

Claims 3-6 and 8-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,774,551 to Wu et al (Wu).

Claims 1-40 remain in this application.

35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,226,752 to Gupta et al (Gupta). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of the claims.

Independent claim 1 recites in part “expiring cookies from the browser in accordance with the request, wherein the cookies include data provided to the browser by the server”.

Gupta fails to teach or suggest the method of claim 1. Gupta describes “[a] method and apparatus for authenticating users” (i.e., clients), where “[o]ne or more embodiments of the invention may utilize cookies to aid in the authentication process”. See abstract of Gupta.

Browsers may send (forward) requests and any associated cookies to the application server. Gupta, col. 11 lines 46-48. “To locate a session, the cookie

1 that is forwarded from the browser may be examined and compared to sessions
2 currently active. If no cookie is forwarded from the browser, the session is not
3 valid". Gupta, col. 11 line 66 to col. 12 line 6.

4 A user may issue a logout request to the server by entering a logout URL at
5 the browser or clicking a link on the browser. To effectuate the logout, the
6 browser may send the request to the server (i.e., application server and login
7 server), and forward the associated cookie with the request. Gupta col. 13 lines
8 45-51. The cookie identifies the user that is requesting the logout. "Without the
9 cookie, the server may not know who is requesting a logout." Gupta col. 13 lines
10 54-55.

11 The server determines if the cookie is valid. If the cookie is valid, the
12 application server may invalidate the current session for the user and send back a
13 notification to the browser that the user has been logged out. If the cookie is not
14 valid, the server may do nothing further or may notify the user that the request
15 cannot be processed. The cookie for the login server is transmitted to the client's
16 browser. By storing the cookie, the login sever can determine if the client has been
17 previously been authenticated, which overcomes the requirement of the client to
18 have to reenter information. Gupta col. 13 lines 57-64.

19 The server (i.e., login server) may force the user to logout because the time
20 for the current session has expired. For example, if the user connection is
21 terminated prior to logging out (e.g., user modem is turned off). The user is
22 automatically logged out by terminating the session. To logout a user, the
23 application server may check with the login server to see if the user session is still
24 valid. If still valid, the application server may reset the time period for that
25 session. If the session is no longer valid, the application server may destroy the

1 session causing the rejection of further requests from the user (browser). Gupta
2 col 13 line 65 to col. 14 line 10.

3 Claim 1 recites "expiring cookies from the browser in accordance with the
4 request, wherein the cookies include data provided to the browser by the server".

5 The Examiner maintains that "Gupta inherently teaches expiring cookies
6 from the browser by teaching that the cookie (which contains the information
7 regarding whether or not the user is logged in) is forwarded to the application
8 server - by way of a browser - in order to invalidate (that is, to expire) the current
9 session - which inherently requires the cookie to reflect the changed log-in status
10 and thereby expire them".

11 Applicants do not disagree with the Office in that Gupta teaches a cookie is
12 forwarded (sent) from the browser and that current sessions are invalidated or
13 expired. The cookie taught in Gupta is used to identify the user to the application
14 server and login server. The cookie is used to login and/or validate the user by
15 information to the server as to who the user is. Although sessions are expired,
16 there is nothing in Gupta that teaches or shows that the cookie are expired. To
17 expire cookies is counterintuitive to what is taught in Gupta.

18 Gupta teaches a cookie that contains user information used to identify the
19 user to the application server and login server. In fact, the purpose of a cookie is
20 to identify a user to a server or website, where a user associated with the cookie
21 has previously visited. If such a cookie is expired from the browser, there would
22 be no cookie that the browser can send to the login server and "[w]ithout the
23 cookie, the server may not know who is requesting a logout." Cookies are used to
24 identify the user.
25

1 In performing a logout, Gupta relies on validating the user through the
2 cookie that identifies the user. Therefore if the cookie is expired or retired, there
3 would not be a cookie to send to allow the logout procedure.

4 Gupta teaches that current sessions are expired, not cookies. The Examiner
5 has assumed that if cookies are forwarded to an application server, that this
6 inherently requires updating the cookie to reflect the changed log-in status and
7 expires them (cookies). However, the cookies are never expired. To expire the
8 cookies results in the inability to be able to authenticate or recognize users.

9 The Examiner seemingly relies on personal knowledge without pointing to
10 any specific teaching. Specifically, the Examiner merely contends that if cookies
11 are forwarded, they inherently update the cookie and thereby expire the cookie
12 (previous cookie). The Examiner fails to point out where in Gupta it is taught
13 "expiring cookies".

14 According to 37 CFR §1.104(d)(2), "[w]hen a rejection in an application is
15 based on facts within the personal knowledge of an employee of the office, the
16 data shall be as specific as possible, and the reference must be supported, when
17 called for by the applicant, by the affidavit of such employee, and such affidavit
18 shall be subject to contradiction or explanation by the affidavits of the applicant
19 and other persons." If this rejection is maintained on a similar basis in a
20 subsequent action, the applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to supply such
21 an affidavit to support this modification of Gupta. Otherwise, and without
22 additional support, it is respectfully submitted the Action's conclusion does not
23 represent the conclusion of a person of ordinary skill at the time of invention
24
25

1 Accordingly, Gupta does not show every element of claim 1, and the
2 rejection of claim 1 is therefore improper. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully
3 request that the §102 rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

4 Independent claim 7 recites in part "causing a request for data from the
5 server to be issued by the browser, wherein the request causes the server to expire
6 cookies from the browser". As discussed above in support of claim 1, Gupta fails
7 to teach or show cookies that are expired from the browser.

8 Accordingly, Gupta does not show every element of claim 7, and the
9 rejection of claim 7 is therefore improper. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully
10 request that the §102 rejection of claim 7 be withdrawn.

11
12 **35 U.S.C. §103**

13 Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over
14 Gupta.

15 Dependent claim 2 depends from claim 1, and comprises the element
16 "expiring cookies from the browser in accordance with the request, wherein the
17 cookies include data provided to the browser by the server".

18 As discussed above in support of claim 1, Gupta fails to teach expiring
19 cookies from the browser, since doing so would defeat the teachings of Gupta to
20 use a cookie to validate a user to a server. Without the cookie, as taught by Gupta,
21 the user would not be able to perform a logout from the server.

22 The Office maintains that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary
23 skill in art to combine to acknowledge a successful logout as further recited in the
24 element of claim 2 "wherein the request further causes the server to send an image
25 to the browser which is indicative of successful logout". However, since Gupta

1 fails to teach or suggest expiring cookies from the browser, it would not have been
2 obvious to combine Gupta with what the Office maintains as what was obvious to
3 one of ordinary skill in the art.

4 Accordingly, Gupta does not show every element of claim 2, and the
5 rejection of claim 2 is therefore improper. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully
6 request that the §103 rejection of claim 2 be withdrawn.

7
8 Claims 3-6 and 8-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being
9 unpatentable over Gupta in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,774,551 to Wu et al (Wu).

10 **Dependent claim 3** depends from claim 1, and therefore comprises the
11 element “expiring cookies from the browser in accordance with the request,
12 wherein the cookies include data provided to the browser by the server”.

13 As discussed above in support of claim 1, Gupta fails to teach expiring
14 cookies from the browser, since doing so would defeat the teachings of Gupta to
15 use a cookie to validate a user to a server. Without the cookie, as taught by Gupta,
16 the user would not be able to perform a logout from the server.

17 The Office relies on Wu as teaching “the method wherein multiple servers
18 are logged out by selection of a single logout link”. However, Wu provides no
19 assistance in light of Gupta as to the recited method of claim 3. Since Gupta does
20 not teach or suggest “expiring cookies from the browser in accordance with the
21 request, wherein the cookies include data provided to the browser by the server”, it
22 would not have been obvious to combine “the method wherein multiple servers are
23 logged out by selection of a single logout link” as taught by Wu.

1 Accordingly, Gupta in view of Wu does not show every element of claim 3
2 and the rejection of claim 3 is therefore improper. Accordingly, Applicants
3 respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 3 be withdrawn.

4 **Dependent claim 26** depends from claim 24, and therefore comprises the
5 element "providing a link to an expire cookies page on each server in the form of
6 an image source tag that when called causes each server to expire cookies on both
7 the server and user's browser, and to provide an image back to the browser upon
8 succeeding in logging out the user".

9 As discussed above in support of claims 1 and 7, Gupta fails to teach
10 expiring cookies from the user's browser, since doing so would defeat the
11 teachings of Gupta to use a cookie to validate a user to a server. Without the
12 cookie, as taught by Gupta, the user would not be able to perform a logout from
13 the server.

14 The Office relies on Wu as teaching "the method wherein multiple servers
15 are logged out by selection of a single logout link". However, Wu provides no
16 assistance in light of Gupta as to the recited method of claim 26. Since Gupta does
17 not teach or suggest "... expire cookies on ... user's browser", it would not have
18 been obvious to combine "the method wherein multiple servers are logged out by
19 selection of a single logout link" as taught by Wu.

20 Accordingly, Gupta in view of Wu does not show every element of claim 26
21 and the rejection of claim 26 is therefore improper. Accordingly, Applicants
22 respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 26 be withdrawn.

23 **Dependent claim 4** depends from claim 1, and therefore comprises the
24 element "expiring cookies from the browser in accordance with the request,
25 wherein the cookies include data provided to the browser by the server".

1 As discussed above in support of claim 1, Gupta fails to teach expiring
2 cookies from the browser, since doing so would defeat the teachings of Gupta to
3 use a cookie to validate a user to a server. Without the cookie, as taught by Gupta,
4 the user would not be able to perform a logout from the server.

5 The Office relies on Wu as teaching "the method wherein the logout link
6 may be located on any of the multiple servers and an authentication server".
7 However, Wu provides no assistance in light of Gupta as to the recited method of
8 claim 4. Since Gupta does not teach or suggest "expiring cookies from the
9 browser in accordance with the request, wherein the cookies include data provided
10 to the browser by the server", it would not have been obvious to combine "the
11 method wherein the logout link may be located on any of the multiple servers and
12 an authentication server" as taught by Wu.

13 Accordingly, Gupta in view of Wu does not show every element of claim 4
14 and the rejection of claim 4 is therefore improper. Accordingly, Applicants
15 respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 4 be withdrawn.

16 **Dependent claim 5** depends from claim 1, and therefore comprises the
17 element "expiring cookies from the browser in accordance with the request,
18 wherein the cookies include data provided to the browser by the server".

19 As discussed above in support of claim 1, Gupta fails to teach expiring
20 cookies from the browser, since doing so would defeat the teachings of Gupta to
21 use a cookie to validate a user to a server. Without the cookie, as taught by Gupta,
22 the user would not be able to perform a logout from the server.

23 The Office relies on Wu as teaching "the method wherein a visited sites
24 cookie maintains a list of all sites logged into by the user". However, Wu provides
25 no assistance in light of Gupta as to the recited method of claim 5. Since Gupta

1 does not teach or suggest "expiring cookies from the browser in accordance with
2 the request, wherein the cookies include data provided to the browser by the
3 server", it would not have been obvious to combine "the method wherein a visited
4 sites cookie maintains a list of all sites logged into by the user" as taught by Wu.

5 Accordingly, Gupta in view of Wu does not show every element of claim 5
6 and the rejection of claim 5 is therefore improper. Accordingly, Applicants
7 respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 5 be withdrawn.

8 **Dependent claim 6** depends from claim 1, and therefore comprises the
9 element "expiring cookies from the browser in accordance with the request,
10 wherein the cookies include data provided to the browser by the server".

11 As discussed above in support of claim 1, Gupta fails to teach expiring
12 cookies from the browser, since doing so would defeat the teachings of Gupta to
13 use a cookie to validate a user to a server. Without the cookie, as taught by Gupta,
14 the user would not be able to perform a logout from the server.

15 The Office relies on Wu as teaching "the method wherein selected cookies
16 are expired to log out of the server". However, Wu provides no assistance in light
17 of Gupta as to the recited method of claim 6. Since Gupta does not teach or
18 suggest "expiring cookies from the browser in accordance with the request,
19 wherein the cookies include data provided to the browser by the server", it would
20 not have been obvious to combine "the method wherein selected cookies are
21 expired to log out of the server" as taught by Wu.

22 Accordingly, Gupta in view of Wu does not show every element of claim 6
23 and the rejection of claim 6 is therefore improper. Accordingly, Applicants
24 respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 6 be withdrawn.
25

1 **Claims 8-9** are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in the rejection of
2 claims 2-3. Applicants assert the arguments as presented in support of claims 2-3,
3 in support of claims 8-9.

4 Accordingly, Gupta in view of Wu does not show every element of claims
5 8-9 and the rejection of claims 8-9 is therefore improper. Accordingly, Applicants
6 respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claims 8-9 be withdrawn.

7 **Claims 10, 15-18 and 24** are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in
8 the rejection of claims 1-3. Claims 16, 17, and 18 have been amended to recite
9 “expiring cookies”. Applicants assert the arguments as presented in support of
10 claims 1-3, in support of claims 10, 15-18 and 24.

11 Accordingly, Gupta in view of Wu does not show every element of claims
12 10, 15-18 and 24 and the rejection of claims 10, 15-18 and 24 is therefore
13 improper. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of
14 claims 10, 15-18 and 24 be withdrawn.

15 **Claim 11** is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in the rejection of
16 claims 1-3 and 5. Applicants assert the arguments as presented in support of
17 claims 1-3 and 5, in support of claim 11.

18 Accordingly, Gupta in view of Wu does not show every element of claim 11
19 and the rejection of claim 11 is therefore improper. Accordingly, Applicants
20 respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 11 be withdrawn.

21 **Claims 12, 13, 22, 23, 25, 28 and 33-40** are rejected for the same reasons
22 as set forth in the rejection of claim 5. Applicants assert the arguments as
23 presented in support of claims 5, in support of claims 12, 13, 22, 23, 25, 28 and 33-
24 40.

25

1 Accordingly, Gupta in view of Wu does not show every element of claims
2 13, 22, 23, 25, 28 and 33-40 and the rejection of claims 13, 22, 23, 25, 28 and 33-
3 40 is therefore improper. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the
4 §103 rejection of claims 13, 22, 23, 25, 28 and 33-40 be withdrawn.

5 **Dependent claims 14 depends from claim 11, and therefore comprises the**
6 **element “a module that provides a link to an expire cookies page on each server**
7 **that when called causes each server to expire cookies on the user's browser, and to**
8 **provide an image back to the browser upon succeeding in logging the user out”.**

9 As discussed above in support of claims 1 and 7, Gupta fails to teach
10 expiring cookies on the user's browser, since doing so would defeat the teachings
11 of Gupta to use a cookie to validate a user to a server. Without the cookie, as
12 taught by Gupta, the user would not be able to perform a logout from the server.

13 The Office maintains that “[a]t the time the invention was made, it would
14 have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to allow the request for a
15 logout page to be initiated via more than one server page”. However, this assertion
16 by the Office provides no assistance in light of Gupta as to the recited system of
17 claim 14. Since Gupta does not teach or suggest “to expire cookies on the user's
18 browser” it would not have been obvious to combine the Office's assertion.

19 Accordingly, Gupta in view of the Office's assertion does not show every
20 element of claim 14 and the rejection of claim 14 is therefore improper.
21 Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 14 be
22 withdrawn.

23 **Dependent claim 27 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in the**
24 **rejection of claim 14. Applicants assert the arguments as presented in support of**
25 **claims 14, in support of claim 27.**

1 Accordingly, Gupta in view of the Office's assertion does not show every
2 element of claim 27 and the rejection of claim 27 is therefore improper.
3 Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 27 be
4 withdrawn.

5 Dependent claim 19 depends from claim 18, and therefore comprises the
6 element "retiring cookies identified by responses to the get image requests".

7 As discussed above in support of claims 1 and 7, Gupta fails to retiring
8 cookies, since doing so would defeat the teachings of Gupta to use a cookie to
9 validate a user to a server. Without the cookie, as taught by Gupta, the user would
10 not be able to perform a logout from the server.

11 The Office takes Official Notice "that a checkmark image is a symbol for
12 affirmative, a positive result, or a task complete was well known in the art at the
13 time the invention was made". However, the Official Notice taken provides no
14 assistance in light of Gupta as to the recited method of claim 19. Since Gupta does
15 not teach or suggest "retiring cookies identified by responses to the get image
16 requests" it would not have been obvious to combine the Official Notice taken by
17 the Office.

18 Accordingly, Gupta in view of Official Notice does not show every element
19 of claim 19 and the rejection of claim 19 is therefore improper. Accordingly,
20 Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 19 be withdrawn.

21 Dependent claim 20 depends from claim 18, and therefore comprises the
22 element "retiring cookies identified by responses to the get image requests".

23 As discussed above in support of claims 1 and 7, Gupta fails to retiring
24 cookies, since doing so would defeat the teachings of Gupta to use a cookie to
25

1 validate a user to a server. Without the cookie, as taught by Gupta, the user would
2 not be able to perform a logout from the server.

3 The Office maintains that “[a]t the time the invention was made, it would
4 have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to ensure that any piece of
5 data downloaded was the most current”. However, this assertion by the Office
6 provides no assistance in light of Gupta as to the recited method of claim 20.
7 Since Gupta does not teach or suggest “expiring cookies identified by responses to
8 the get image requests” it would not have been obvious to combine the Office’s
9 assertion.

10 Accordingly, Gupta in view of the Office’s assertion does not show every
11 element of claim 20 and the rejection of claim 20 is therefore improper.
12 Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 20 be
13 withdrawn.

14 **Dependent claim 21** depends from claim 18, and therefore comprises the
15 element “expiring cookies identified by responses to the get image requests”.

16 As discussed above in support of claims 1 and 7, Gupta fails to retiring
17 cookies, since doing so would defeat the teachings of Gupta to use a cookie to
18 validate a user to a server. Without the cookie, as taught by Gupta, the user would
19 not be able to perform a logout from the server.

20 The Office takes Official Notice “including a query in an image tag in a
21 computer networking environment was well known in the art at the time the
22 invention was made”. However, the Official Notice taken provides no assistance
23 in light of Gupta as to the recited method of claim 21. Since Gupta does not teach
24 or suggest “retiring cookies identified by responses to the get image requests” it
25 would not have been obvious to combine the Official Notice taken by the Office.

1 Accordingly, Gupta in view of Official Notice does not show every element
2 of claim 21 and the rejection of claim 21 is therefore improper. Accordingly,
3 Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 21 be withdrawn.

4 Claims 29-32 are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in the rejection
5 of claims 18, 20, and 21. Applicants assert the arguments as presented in support
6 of claims 18, 20, and 21, in support of claims 29-32.

7 Accordingly, Gupta in view of Wu, Office's assertion, and Official notice
8 does not show every element of claims 29-32 and the rejection of claims 29-32 is
9 therefore improper. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the §103
10 rejection of claims 29-32 be withdrawn.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CONCLUSION

All pending claims 1-40 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 6/6/05By: 

Emmanuel A. Rivera
Reg. No. 45,760
(509) 324-9256 ext. 245